

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Demetrius Franklin Dixon,)	C/A No. 5:15-cv-03383-BHH-KDW
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
vs.)	
)	REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION
Scotty Bodiford;)	(Partial Summary Dismissal)
Practitioner Eastergard;)	
Officer Daughtery;)	
Officer Leeman;)	
Officer Rejornis;)	
Nurse Hines, and)	
One Unknown Nurse,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
)	

This is a civil action filed pro se by a local detention center detainee. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1), and Local Civil Rule 73.02(B)(2)(e) (D.S.C.), this magistrate judge is authorized to review all pretrial matters in such pro se cases and to submit findings and recommendations to the district court. *See* 28 U.S.C. §§ 1915(e); 1915A (as soon as possible after docketing, district courts should review prisoner cases to determine whether they are subject to summary dismissal).

I. Factual Background

Demetrius Franklin Dixon (“Plaintiff”) is a pretrial detainee at the Greenville County Detention Center (“GCDC”). In the Complaint under review, Plaintiff alleges that he has been subjected to cruel and unusual punishment at GCDC because his living quarters are infested by spiders and insects and no effort is made to bring the infestation under control. Compl. 3, ECF No. 1. Plaintiff also alleges that he has been subjected to medical indifference at GCDC because he was bitten by a spider, but his requests for medical assistance were ignored and/or minimized

for five days by Defendants Eastergard, Daugherty, Leeman, Rejornis, Hines, and Unknown Nurse, resulting in his having to contend with considerable untreated pain and anguish. *Id.* at 3-4. Plaintiff also alleges that the medical treatment he did receive was inadequate and that his requests for additional care have been ignored or delayed. *Id.* Plaintiff seeks injunctive relief and compensatory damages. *Id.* at 5. Although a seventh Defendant, Scotty Bodiford, is named in the Complaint, there are no allegations against this Defendant anywhere in the body of the pleading.

II. Standard of Review

Under established local procedure in this judicial district, a careful review has been made of Plaintiff's pro se Complaint filed in this case. This review has been conducted pursuant to the procedural provisions of 28 U.S.C. §§ 1915, 1915A, and the Prison Litigation Reform Act of 1996, and in light of the following precedents: *Denton v. Hernandez*, 504 U.S. 25 (1992); *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 324-25 (1989); *Haines v. Kerner*, 404 U.S. 519 (1972); *Nasim v. Warden, Md. House of Corr.*, 64 F.3d 951 (4th Cir. 1995); *Todd v. Baskerville*, 712 F.2d 70 (4th Cir. 1983); *Boyce v. Alizaduh*, 595 F.2d 948 (4th Cir. 1979).

Pro se complaints are held to a less stringent standard than those drafted by attorneys, *Gordon v. Leeke*, 574 F.2d 1147, 1151 (4th Cir. 1978), and a federal district court is charged with liberally construing a complaint filed by a pro se litigant to allow the development of a potentially meritorious case. *Erickson v. Pardus*, 551 U.S. 89, 94 (2007). When a federal court is evaluating a pro se complaint, the plaintiff's allegations are assumed to be true. *De'Lonta v. Angelone*, 330 F.3d 630, 630 n.1 (4th Cir. 2003). Nevertheless, the requirement of liberal construction does not mean that this court can ignore a clear failure in the pleading to allege facts which set forth a claim currently cognizable in a federal district court. *Weller v. Dep't of Soc. Servs.*, 901 F.2d 387, 391 (4th Cir. 1990). Even under this less stringent standard, the Complaint

filed in this case is subject to partial summary dismissal under the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B).

III. Discussion

The Complaint is subject to partial summary dismissal as to Defendant Scotty Bodiford because a careful review of the Complaint reveals no allegations of wrongdoing by this Defendant. Under the provisions of the Prison Litigation Reform Act, more specifically 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B), this court should dismiss an action filed by a prisoner which is “frivolous” or “fails to state a claim on which relief may be granted.” Because there are no allegations of any wrongdoing by Defendant Bodiford, Plaintiff’s Complaint is both frivolous and fails to state a claim on which relief can be granted as to this Defendant. *See Potter v. Clark*, 497 F.2d 1206, 1207 (7th Cir. 1974) (“Where a complaint alleges no specific act or conduct on the part of the defendant and the complaint is silent as to the defendant except for his name appearing in the caption, the complaint is properly dismissed.”); *Newkirk v. Circuit Court of City of Hampton*, No. 3:14CV372-HEH, 2014 WL 4072212 (E.D. Va. Aug. 14, 2014) (complaint subject to summary dismissal where no factual allegations against named defendants within the body of the pleading); *see also Krych v. Hvass*, 83 F. App’x 854, 855 (8th Cir. 2003); *Black v. Lane*, 22 F.3d 1395, 1401 n.8 (7th Cir. 1994); *Walker v. Hodge*, 4 F.3d 991, * 2 n. 2 (5th Cir. 1993); *Banks v. Scott*, 3:13CV363, 2014 WL 5430987, at *2 (E.D. Va. Oct. 24, 2014). In absence of substantive allegations of wrongdoing against the named Defendant, there is nothing from which this court can liberally construe any type of plausible cause of action arising from the Complaint against him. *See Cochran v. Morris*, 73 F.3d 1310 (4th Cir. 1996) (statute allowing dismissal of *in forma pauperis* claims encompasses complaints that are either legally or factually baseless); *Weller v. Dep’t of Social Servs.*, 901 F.2d at 389 n.2 (dismissal proper where there

were no allegations to support claim).

Furthermore, that Defendant Bodiford is the Director at GCDC and overall supervisor of the other Defendants is not, alone, a basis on which to hold him liable to Plaintiff for the alleged wrongdoing of Bodiford's subordinates. To assert a plausible constitutional-violation claim against any particular public official under 42 U.S.C. § 1983,¹ a plaintiff's allegations must show a causal connection or affirmative link between the conduct of which the plaintiff complains and the official sued. *See Rizzo v. Goode*, 423 U.S. 362, 371-72 (1976) (a § 1983 plaintiff must show that he suffered a specific injury as a result of specific conduct of a defendant, and an affirmative link between the injury and that conduct); *Vinnedge v. Gibbs*, 550 F.2d 926, 928 (4th Cir. 1977) (for an individual to be liable under § 1983, it must be affirmatively shown that the official charged acted personally in the deprivation of the plaintiff's rights); *see also Kentucky v. Graham*, 473 U.S. 159, 166 (1985). As a general rule, the doctrine of vicarious liability or *respondeat superior* is not available to a § 1983 plaintiff as a means to create liability of a state-actor supervisor for the acts or his/her subordinate. *See Monell v. Dep't of Soc. Servs.*, 436 U.S. 658, 694 (1978).

IV. Recommendation

Accordingly, it is recommended that the district court partially summarily dismiss the Complaint in this case *without prejudice* to the extent that Scotty Bodiford is named a Defendant.

¹ Plaintiff's claims for damages allegedly arising from the conditions of his confinement within a local detention center in South Carolina are properly considered by this court under its federal question jurisdiction pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Section 1983 is the procedural mechanism through which Congress provided a private civil cause of action based on allegations of federal constitutional violations by persons acting under color of state law. *Jett v. Dallas Indep. Sch. Dist.*, 491 U.S. 701, 731-32 (1989). The purpose of § 1983 is to deter state actors from using badge of their authority to deprive individuals of their *federally guaranteed* rights and to provide relief to victims if such deterrence fails. *Wyatt v. Cole*, 504 U.S. 158, 161 (1992) (citation omitted) (emphasis added). No other viable basis for the exercise of this court's subject matter jurisdiction over Plaintiff's allegations is evident from the face of the Complaint.

See Brown v. Briscoe, 998 F.2d 201, 202-04 (4th Cir. 1993); *see also* 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B); 28 U.S.C. § 1915A (as soon as possible after docketing, district courts should review prisoner cases to determine whether they are subject to summary dismissal). The Complaint should be served on the remaining Defendants.

IT IS SO RECOMMENDED.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Kaymani D. West".

September 23, 2015
Florence, South Carolina

Kaymani D. West
United States Magistrate Judge

**The parties are directed to note the important information in the attached
“Notice of Right to File Objections to Report and Recommendation.”**

Notice of Right to File Objections to Report and Recommendation

The parties are advised that they may file specific written objections to this Report and Recommendation with the District Judge. Objections must specifically identify the portions of the Report and Recommendation to which objections are made and the basis for such objections. “[I]n the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a de novo review, but instead must ‘only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.’” *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310 (4th Cir. 2005) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee’s note).

Specific written objections must be filed within fourteen (14) days of the date of service of this Report and Recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b); *see* Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(a), (d). Filing by mail pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 5 may be accomplished by mailing objections to:

**Robin L. Blume, Clerk
United States District Court
Post Office Box 2317
Florence, South Carolina 29503**

Failure to timely file specific written objections to this Report and Recommendation will result in waiver of the right to appeal from a judgment of the District Court based upon such Recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140 (1985); *Wright v. Collins*, 766 F.2d 841 (4th Cir. 1985); *United States v. Schronce*, 727 F.2d 91 (4th Cir. 1984).